

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 862

OD 019 521

AUTHOR MacDonald, Tom; Piliavin, Irving
TITLE The Effects of Separation of Services and Income Maintenance on AFDC Recipients. Discussion Paper No. 528-78.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin Univ., Madison. Inst. for Research on Poverty.
PUB DATE Mar 79
NOTE 77p.
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agency Role; Delivery Systems; Income; *Money Management; *Organizational Change; *Public Opinion; *Public Policy; Research; Social Responsibility; Social Services; *Welfare Agencies; *Welfare Recipients

ABSTRACT

In recent years the delivery of social services in public welfare agencies has been separated from income maintenance responsibilities. This change has received support from many sources, including social workers. However, no systematic effort has been made to ascertain welfare recipients' response to separation. This report describes a field experiment that was designed to examine some of these responses. The experimental results suggest that the pre-separation form of social service delivery leads to greater recipient demand for and greater satisfaction with services. Some implications of these results for social policy formation are discussed. (Author)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED 171862

JUN 7 1979

#528-78

INSTITUTE FOR RESEARCH ON POVERTY DISCUSSION PAPERS

THE EFFECTS OF SEPARATION OF SERVICES AND INCOME
MAINTENANCE ON AFDC RECIPIENTS

Tom MacDonald

Irving Piliavin

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Skidmore

Inst. for Research on
Poverty

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."



UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN - MADISON

UD019521

The Effects of Separation of Services and Income
Maintenance on AFDC Recipients

Tom MacDonald

Irvin Piliavin

March 1979

The research reported here was supported by funds granted to the Institute for Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin-Madison by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare pursuant to the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The conclusions expressed herein are those of the authors.

ABSTRACT

In recent years the delivery of social services in public welfare agencies has been separated from income maintenance responsibilities. This change has received support from many sources, including social workers. However, no systematic effort has been made to ascertain welfare recipients' responses to separation. This report describes a field experiment that was designed to examine some of these responses. The experimental results suggest that the preseparation form of social service delivery leads to greater recipient demand for and greater satisfaction with services. Some implications of these results for social policy formation are discussed.

The Effects of Separation of Services and Income
Maintenance on AFDC Recipients

Tom MacDonald

and

Irving Piliavin

According to at least one authority, the separation of financial aid from provision of services in public welfare agencies has been "one of the most important and fundamental. . . developments in public welfare."¹ Among social work scholars there has been substantial support for separation,² and only infrequent criticism.³ However, the response of AFDC recipients to separation has never been assessed. The study reported here sought to fill that gap. The approach was to give AFDC recipients a sustained experience (up to one year) with some variant of the separated or integrated form of service delivery. The responses of interest to the investigators were recipients' requests for services and their assessments of the help they received.

1. SEPARATION: HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

Separation of aid and services in public welfare has two components. The first involves giving responsibility for social service delivery to one group of workers while assigning public assistance eligibility determination and grant supervision tasks to another. Members of the first group have been designated variously as social workers, service workers, and caseworkers. Members of the second group, generally believed to need lower skills and less training for their work, have been called case aids and eligibility technicians.

The second component of separation concerns the conditions for requesting services. When workers had both service and grant supervision responsibilities they periodically took the initiative to visit with welfare recipients, at which time they not only assessed need for continued financial aid but offered counseling services on family and economic problems.⁴ Under separation, however, service workers normally have no contact with public assistance families unless their help is specifically requested by the client. The only contacts families can expect to have routinely with welfare department personnel are with those case aids responsible for redetermining eligibility for financial aid.

Social work proponents of separation argue that it offers solutions to at least three problems that they believe have vitiated the effectiveness and legitimacy of social services in public assistance. First, they say, it relieves services of the "allatross of relief";⁵ second, it makes possible the provision of services under nonadversary and nondemeaning conditions;⁶ third, it permits services to be rendered in a manner assuring recipients' freedom of choice.⁷ These points require brief amplification.

In advocating separation in a 1962 editorial,⁸ Gordon Hamilton argued that if clerical level workers were given the responsibilities involved in monitoring public assistance grants, caseworkers could perform service functions with increased consistency and effectiveness. In the late 1960s and early 1970s George Hoshino wrote several papers expanding Hamilton's argument. According to Hoshino, provision of social services in the integrated framework that existed through the 1960s not only confused service and income maintenance functions but demeaned recipients. Two basic assumptions of service provision under integration, said Hoshino, were that families receiving

public assistance were in poverty because of personal pathologies and that social services could reduce these pathologies.⁹ The first assumption, Hoshino claimed, distorted the real life situations of many recipients. The second justified the instigation of social services independent of recipients' requests, and thus led to a practice which denied individuals' freedom to determine their own fate.¹⁰ Separation, on the other hand, enabled income maintenance recipients to define their situation in their own terms and provided them with service only if they desired it. Separation also permitted them to obtain service from individuals with whom they were not in an adversary relationship.

It must be noted that there are some ideal-type representations in the preceding portrayals of the provision of social services. Studies by Briar and by Handler and Hollingsworth have suggested that prior to separation public assistance caseworkers visited most welfare recipients only infrequently, and that the substance of these visits, aside from grant review, was rather innocuous.¹¹ Workers rarely engaged in therapeutically-oriented counseling activities, but rather spent most of their time discussing work possibilities, child-rearing concerns, health, budget management, and other day-to-day coping problems.¹² Recipients, for their part, generally reported that their contacts with caseworkers were not unpleasant, and some found certain aspects of these contacts helpful.¹³

The Briar and Handler and Hollingsworth findings notwithstanding, there were policies and practices associated with integrated services that warranted criticism. Hoshino's concern with the demeaning character of service in the integrated format was a clear possibility, if not a frequent reality. Workers who presumably were to serve recipients were generally ill-equipped to do their

work.¹⁴ Agencies, in their efforts to acquire federal funds intended to promote services, expanded the service concept to include activities that involved grant supervision and administration.¹⁵ And above all, while the social policies that expanded casework among public assistance recipients were based on the premise that social services would reduce economic dependency, they apparently did not. In the course of a large-scale expansion of social services in public welfare agencies there was also a significant increase in AFDC caseloads. These latter considerations contributed to a disaffection among political leaders with the service concept in public assistance. Since separation offered the possibility of reducing services it drew their favor.

But while social workers and politicians came to favor separation, albeit for somewhat different reasons, no systematic effort was made to determine how it might affect welfare recipients' perception and use of services. Although Hoshino's arguments suggest that recipients might favor separation, neither he nor anyone else has data to back up this conclusion. Admittedly, this failure to ascertain clients' probable responses to a social service policy before implementation is not unique; yet in this instance assessment seems particularly relevant for at least two reasons. From the standpoint of social work, separation was intended, in part, to benefit welfare recipients through improved quality of service. Furthermore, and more generally, social work literature during the past decade has placed great emphasis on the importance of clients' interests and demands in the provision of social services.¹⁶ Accordingly, some assessment of these demands seemed in order whatever the views of policymakers and social workers

on the provision of social services. We think that assessment is still in order if only to determine what effects the separation policy has had on those whom it was intended to help.

2. THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

We noted in the previous section that there is no prior social policy research to indicate what recipient response to separation might be. A review of the pertinent sociological and social-psychological literature reveals somewhat ambiguous implications. Reactance theory, a fairly recent development in social psychology,¹⁷ states that individuals tend to reject features of their situation that constrain their freedom to select alternative courses of action. Integrating (combining) social services with public assistance grant supervision implies the possibility that service workers will intrude on recipients' lives. It also puts these workers in the position of monitoring recipients' financial expenditures. Thus, the theory suggests, welfare recipients whose workers monitor grants and are free to initiate service contacts would be less positive about and less often seek social services than would recipients in separated situations.

Attribution theory, in contrast, suggests the hypothesis that welfare recipients will favor integrated and worker-initiated services.¹⁸ According to attribution theory, the request for help is self-depreciating and an admission of incompetence. The individual making the request acknowledges an inability to cope with the problem at hand, and for problems that touch on an individual's core attributes such requests are particularly difficult. According to this theory, the easier it is to make service requests the less

negative will be the affect accompanying the requests and the more often they will occur. The conditions under combined and worker-initiated service caseloads appear to facilitate requests in at least two ways. First, workers may be viewed as concerned and not simply intrusive when they initiate appointments for service or assist recipients in grant and budget matters. Under these circumstances service requests should be easier to make than in conditions involving separation where workers, because they do not initiate contacts are not able to behaviorally indicate concern for recipients' well-being. Second, recipient requests for service may be further eased in the course of worker-initiated contacts because much of the effort and inconvenience in getting service started has already taken place. The recipient is, in effect, able to request service "in passing."

The attribution theory prediction has found some support in two experimental studies. Tessler and Schwartz found that help seekers were more likely to ask for assistance when they could attribute their failures to external conditions rather than personal characteristics.¹⁹ More recently, Broll, Gross, and Piliavin found that persons attempting to solve a difficult logic problem preferred and used more assistance from those helpers who offered it than from those who rendered it only on request.²⁰ Certainly the context of these studies fails to tap the severity and complexity of circumstances determining welfare recipient demand for services and attitudes toward social service workers. The field study described below is an attempt to overcome these limitations.

3. DESIGN

The study, conducted in the Hennepin County (Minneapolis) Public Welfare Department from November 1971 (first intake) to January 1974 (termination of

last case), involved the experimental manipulation of three factors. The first two factors reflect the two dimensions of the separation policy--function separation and source of service initiation. Two conditions of service delivery were imposed. In the integrated condition, workers who provided social services also carried out budget checks, reviewed eligibility, and in general provided the joint eligibility-service functions carried out by public welfare workers prior to the federally directed changes. In the separated condition, workers who provided social services did not engage in eligibility management operations. These operations were performed by an agency eligibility technician (ET) who alone handled the financial matters.

Service initiation also was constrained to two forms. In the client-initiated service condition, clients were told that if they required assistance with nonfinancial, personal, or family problems, they could simply request this aid from a social service worker assigned to them by the agency. In the worker-initiated condition, clients were not only told how to request service but were also informed that an agency social service worker would visit with them once every two months. This practice was explained on the grounds that in the agency's experience people receiving public financial assistance required service periodically. Under both treatments this procedural information was given to the new recipient in a face-to-face interview with the agency social service worker who was to be the recipient's service worker, and who subsequently operated in accord with the condition assigned that recipient.

The third factor manipulated in the field experiment concerned the amount and quality of information provided welfare recipients regarding the availability of health and social services that they might require. Under the standard statement condition, recipients were simply told during

the initial interview about the types of services available. The second condition involved a normative statement that not only told about these services but emphasized that the client had a right to these services and should demand them if desired. In addition, recipients in the normative condition were given a pamphlet prepared by project staff describing available services in the community.

This variable was included in the study primarily because of its social policy relevance. Organizations representing welfare recipients have contended that their constituencies have a right to full information about the various health and social services for which they are eligible. These organizations also contend that public welfare agencies typically provide recipients only minimal information about service entitlement, out of fear that full information on entitlements will lead to increased--and perhaps nonessential--use of services and greatly increased costs. Since we are not aware of any research on the consequences of a "full information policy," we included these manipulations in the research design. The full information manipulation is also of interest as an attempt to overcome some of the problems of linking services to clients which may derive from separation. We have suggested that separation may lead to less use of social service by AFDC recipients. If so, it is possible that certain forms of communication, such as the normative format employed in this study, may serve to maintain recipient knowledge of and comfort in using these services. The basic design of the Hennepin County field project, then, comprises eight experimental treatments represented by the cells in Figure 1.

One additional control cell was included, consisting of individuals who met qualifications for inclusion in the service program but with whom no project service contacts were made. These recipient controls received the normal service provided by the Hennepin County Welfare Department: separated, client-

initiated, and with standard service information provided. Research interviews like those conducted with project members were held with controls, to provide data regarding the impact of the experiment on recipients. This was done by comparing findings for the controls with those of comparable experimentals, namely those in the separated client-initiated condition. The large size of this control group also provided an opportunity for a split sample pretesting of hypotheses and an exploratory study of client characteristics that are associated with use of social services. This phase of the project is explained more fully in a later section.

In order to obtain a relatively homogeneous sample, those AFDC recipients selected for the project included only:

- 1) Female heads of families who had not previously been welfare recipients as family heads or spouses in Hennepin County.
- 2) Residents of Minneapolis.
- 3) Families that, at the time they became eligible for public assistance, were not "problem" cases as formally defined by the welfare agency and for whom, therefore, social services had to be provided by law. (e.g., neglect cases, child abuse cases, and adoption cases).

The third qualification was included because problem cases were assigned to special, nonproject social service workers, making it impossible to monitor the client-worker interaction.

Table 1 compares some of the basic demographic characteristics of the project sample with a 1973 nationwide probability sample of AFDC recipients. It reveals rather substantial differences between the two samples. Age and family size differences may be attributable to the project eligibility

Figure 1. Experimental Treatment Cells.

Contact Initiated by Client Only		Contact Initiated by Client and Worker	
Maximum Service Information	Standard Service Information	Maximum Service Information	Standard Service Information

Combined

Income
Maintenance
and Service
Functions

Separated

criterion restricting participants to intake cases which involved only first-time recipients in Hennepin County. Education and race differences, however probably reflect regional population patterns, and present serious difficulties in any attempt to generalize from the findings of this project. These issues are addressed in greater detail in the final section of this report.

Service personnel used in the project were agency employees who were paid at overtime rates for their effort in order to ensure rapid and full service. The general design of the project called for each service worker to receive a balanced caseload, that is, an equal number of cases from each sample cell. When workers lost cases as a result of moves, loss of eligibility, or other causes, new cases were assigned so as to maintain balance. The service supervisor's function was to ensure that cases moved smoothly from the welfare agency's financial intake unit to the research team for assessment of project eligibility and--when eligibility was determined--to assign the case to the appropriate worker. The supervisor also acted as liaison between research personnel and the agency administrative staff.

Since workers were randomly assigned cases across all experimental conditions, variations in worker characteristics should not pose any threat to the internal validity of the study. It is important, however, to consider these characteristics in any attempt to generalize from the specific findings to some broader population. Of the nineteen workers serving project cases, seven were male and twelve female. Three workers had masters degrees in social work, fourteen had bachelor degrees, and two had done some graduate work. The mean age of the workers was 32.9 years and their average time in the agency was 5.3 years. Comparisons with data from a 1977 survey indicate that the Hennepin County Welfare Department had, at the time of the

Table 1

Selected Attributes of Project Sample and
National AFDC Caseload Sample

Attribute	Project Sample	National 1973 AFDC Sample(a)
	Mean or Percentage	Median or Percentage
Age	25.7 years	29.8 years
Education	11.6 years	10.5 years
Number of eligible children	1.9	2.6
<u>Marital status</u>		
Married	5.6%	-
Divorced	12.9%	-
Separated	59.3%	-
Never married	18.0%	-
Other	3.2%	-
<u>Race (b)</u>		
White	81.4%	38.0%
Black	13.2%	45.8%
Indian	4.0%	1.1%
Other	1.4%	15.1%

Note: (a) See U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Findings of the 1973 AFDC Study, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

(b) Percentages based only on project worker reports. Agency policy prohibits this information from being placed in records to avoid reactive effects. No effort was made to obtain these data from control case aides. The race of 50 recipients was not reported by project workers. The percentages shown are quite compatible with estimates of the racial distribution of AFDC recipients in the state where this study was undertaken.

project, a somewhat more experienced, more highly trained, and more stable staff than would be found in most urban areas.²¹

When recipients were initially assigned to experimental conditions they received an offer of service (IOS) from the service worker to whom they were assigned. At this time the worker explained that the public welfare office was using various service delivery approaches and that the recipient's family had been assigned to one of these. The procedures for service delivery in that condition were explained and opportunity was given to the recipient to express dissatisfaction and request another assignment. In one instance a recipient did object to the assignment she received and her case was reassigned to the recipient's preferred treatment condition. Data for this case were excluded from the analysis.

Recipients participated in the experimental program for a maximum of twelve months. However, since many recipients moved or became ineligible for welfare benefits prior to the end of the twelve-month period, the average time in the project was only slightly over nine months. The number of experimental recipients served by agency workers in the course of the project totaled 147, while an additional 155 recipients were officially assigned as controls.

Recipients were asked to complete a series of questionnaires at two points in time. Shortly after they were found eligible for inclusion in the experiment they were visited by a member of the research team and asked to complete the questionnaires. The same questionnaires, supplemented by a number of items concerning recipients' views of the welfare agency and the service worker(s) as well as their use of other

services in the community, were administered at the time the subject terminated involvement with the project. At this same time each worker was asked to complete a termination report for each project sample member regarding the worker's impressions of the sample member. These questionnaires were theoretically filled out by all social workers (S.W.) and eligibility technicians (E.T.) who had contact with the client. Thus, "separated" clients had two summary reports (more if there was a change in S.W. or E.T.), "combined" clients had one report (two or more if the client had requested a S.W. or if there was a change in E.T.). Only one summary sheet was coded for each client. In cases where there was more than one questionnaire, the one filled out by the S.W. or E.T. who seemed to know the client best was selected.²² In addition, records were kept during the course of the study by workers on each of their contacts with project recipients.

Variables Studied

Data were gathered for three periods: pre-test, ongoing monitoring and post-test.

Pre-Test. The pre-test measurements included certain demographic data, psychological measures, knowledge of and attitudes toward social services, and attitudes toward the welfare system and welfare workers.

Demographic data. These included recipient's age, marital status, years of schooling, months of vocational training, number of children, length of residency in Hennepin County, size of hometown, and race.

Psychological measurements. These included the Anomie Scale developed by Srole,²³ Rosenberg's Self-Esteem and Self-Rating Scales,²⁴ and the Rotter Internal-External Scales,²⁵ with the Gurin²⁶ modifications for use with blacks

and other disadvantaged groups. The Gurin et al. modifications apply primarily to racial factors that might affect the Internal-External Scale scores. Since the present research dealt with a poor population which was largely white rather than black, the Gurin items were modified slightly to more appropriately pertain to the subjects of this study.

Knowledge and importance of social services. This involved a series of questions on various services such as day care, vocational training, family counseling, and health clinics. Subjects were asked whether they were aware of each service and how important they thought each was.

Attitudes toward the welfare workers and welfare system. A series of questions were designed (and pre-tested prior to their use in Hennepin County) to determine these attitudes. With regard to the agency social workers, these questions involved each recipient's perception of social workers' interest in recipients' well being, their right to give advice, the need to follow this advice, the helpfulness of workers and their advice and the frequency of clients' visits with workers. Concerning the agency, each recipient was asked about how concerned she thought the agency was with those seeking help, how much freedom recipients had to complain to the welfare department, how fair the welfare department was in dealing with recipients, and how satisfied recipients were with the welfare department.

Ongoing Monitoring.

Data were collected during the ongoing monitoring of the project from records turned in by the social workers (S.W.) and eligibility technicians (E.T.) that summarized each contact with project participants. Each contact sheet contained such information as who initiated the contact, how it was made

(office visit, phone, or home visit), the reason for the contact, the services rendered the client by the worker, and the length of time of the contact. Workers were also asked to estimate their clients' satisfaction and to rate the quality of the worker-client interaction during each contact.

Service requests were classified on two dimensions. The first time a subject was discussed with the S.W. or the E.T. it was coded under the heading New Problem. Thereafter any time this same matter was brought up on the contact sheets it was coded as a Continuing Problem.

A second dimension involved differentiating requests for Financial Services from Nonfinancial services. This distinction is, to some degree, similar to the distinction between the roles of the S.W. and the E.T. One deals with financial questions and the other with social problems. The following subject areas came up most often:

Financial

Food Stamps
Furniture and appliances
Rental allowance
Stolen money
Change of address
(implying a budget change)
Late check
Budget problems
New baby (add to grant)

Nonfinancial

Medical, dental care
Family counseling
Child care
Change of address
(give information only)
Homemaker
Marital counseling

Post-test. The post-test data collected included all the pre-test measures plus a series of questions regarding the client's experiences with her worker(s) and the welfare agency, and her use of other services available in the community. The welfare experience questions concerned the same issues as the pre- and post-test attitudinal measure described above; however, they

were reworded to apply directly to the client's experience rather than her general opinion of the situation. For example, the attitudinal question "Is the welfare department concerned with those who come for help?" was changed to read "Is the welfare department concerned with helping you?" in the welfare experience section.

In addition to determining simply whether or not a recipient had used any social services other than County welfare, recipients were asked about delays in seeking help, frequency, duration and usefulness of these contacts, and satisfaction with the agency. A list of 28 social service agencies in Hennepin County was also used to determine which services had been used.

Workers (E.T.s and S.W.s) were also asked to complete a Termination Summary Sheet for each recipient in the project. Data were collected on the worker's estimation of changes in the client's situation and of her attitude toward the worker and agency.

Complications in Implementing the Project

The increased internal and external validity obtained in a field experiment is not secured without some cost. This cost results from the inherent problems in maintaining control over manipulations in an open setting. The primary problem in the Hennepin County Project involved the collection of data on a number of recipients--a total of 108--who could not be included in the analysis.

The major reason for exclusion (63 cases) involved situations in which the subject's project status changed prior to having received an initial offer of service (if assigned to an experimental condition) or within 62 days of registration (if assigned to the control condition).

Distinctions in how the various groups were treated began with the initial offer of service (IOS). It had been intended that the IOS would be made within a few days of the registration for public assistance. Unfortunately, the processing of subjects proved more time consuming than had been anticipated, and the average time from registration to the IOS was 62 days. Those leaving before the IOS, then, never experienced the treatment. To make the control group equivalent (since the controls did not receive an IOS) the criterion was established that an otherwise eligible agency client must remain in the program at least 62 days from the registration date in order to be included in the control group.

Of the remaining excluded cases, most (24 cases) involved situations where an individual not meeting project requirements was mistakenly referred to the project and an initial interview was held before this fact was discovered. Additional reasons for excluding cases involved situations where the subject refused to see a worker for the IOS (7 cases), "botched" cases where the welfare worker did not follow the assigned experimental condition either at the IOS or at a later unknown date (5 cases), subjects who knew about the research study at the time of the IOS (4 cases), subjects for whom there was no record of their having been in the project (4 cases) and 1 subject for whom field staff determined that the initial interview was "uninterpretable."

For the most part the available data for these excluded subjects included only initial interviews and data concerning pre-IOS (or 62 days) interaction with the agency.

4. FINDINGS

Public Assistance Service Utilization

Utilization of services was the major outcome measure of the field experiment. It was also the most objectively defined and vigorously monitored of the various indicators of the impact of the experimental manipulations on welfare recipients. These data were gathered from the worker reports on contacts with clients. Before proceeding to the presentation of the findings concerning utilization of services, it is necessary to explain some terminological distinctions used and the decisions made in arriving at the dependent variables reported.

Service Request. First, let us reiterate that our measure of service desired is based on requests for service rather than on contacts. This is because a client can make any number of requests during a single contact. Requests were classified along two dimensions: new versus continuing problems and financial versus nonfinancial problems.

New Service Requests. As noted above, new service requests indicated the emergence of new problems or the recurrence of old problems following apparent adequate closure. Continuing service requests referred to requests for assistance on problems that had been previously brought up but persisted. It was decided to focus on new service requests since requests for continuing service may have simply reflected worker failure to deliver a previously requested service, rather than a desire for additional aid of a given type. New service requests were expected to provide more sensitive estimates of client utilization since they eliminated this "noise" factor.

Financial and Nonfinancial Service Requests

Financial requests concern economic problems encountered by families, including those involving their grants. Nonfinancial services include counseling, job finding, referral, and efforts to obtain access to other service organizations.

The raw measures of utilization of services were transformed in two ways. Requests per client month were used to control for variations in subjects' length of stay on the project. The distribution of this variable was found to be highly skewed (positively). In order to make more appropriate use of statistical tests based on the assumption of an underlying normal distribution, the data were subjected to a square root transformation prior to analysis. This transformation has the effect of reducing large value outliers having a value greater than one and slightly increasing values which are less than one, thereby "normalizing" the distribution to some extent.²⁷ As a result of this square root transformation, the data presented in Tables 2 and 3 cannot be directly converted to raw scores. Overall, experimental sample members requested services at the rate of 0.47 service requests per client month. Of these requests, approximately 60 percent were for new services while 65 percent were for nonfinancial services.

A two-way analysis of the covariance model was used to test the significance of differences in utilization rates between four experimental groups made up by crossing the two factors comprising the two dimensions of the separation policy. The third experimental factor, which involved the amount and quality of information provided welfare recipients regarding other available health and social services, was not found to be significantly

related to any of the outcome measures and has been excluded from the analysis presented here. Pre-test covariates were identified through a preliminary analysis carried out with a random sampling of 75 percent of the control group. This procedure involved the use of regression analysis to identify the best pre-test predictor variables of the dependent variables for the 75 percent random sample from the control group. The variable or variables explaining the most variance in each of the dependent variables in this sample were then used as covariates in the analysis of the effects of the experimental manipulations on the dependent variables for the remaining cases.²⁸ The remaining 25 percent of the control group was retained for comparison with the comparable experimental group to test for possible placebo effects.

The impact of the experimental manipulations on client request rates for new services are shown in Table 2.²⁹ All requests for new services are included regardless of who initiated the contact. It can be seen that the two manipulations relevant to the separation policy have significant main effects but in different ways. Recipients who were served by only a service worker made significantly more requests for financial services than did recipients served by a service worker and a case aide. This trend holds for nonfinancial service requests but the differences are not statistically significant. Source of help initiation had a highly significant impact on requests for nonfinancial services, with those recipients whose workers were required to initiate contact making more service requests than those who were totally responsible for initiating contact with the worker. This trend also holds for financial requests but the differences are not statistically significant.

Table 2

Effects of Experimental Manipulations on Client Requests for
Public Welfare Services (Across All Contacts)

Dependent Variable	A		B	
	Combined (N=53)	Separated (N=54)	Client-Initiated (N=55)	Worker-Initiated (N=52)
(1) New Requests for Financial Services	.23* (.23) ^a	.13* (.13)	.16 (.16)	.20 (.20)
(2) New Requests for Non-Financial Services	.35 (.35)	.29 (.30)	.22*** (.22)	.42*** (.43)

<u>Covariates</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>Significant Interactions</u>	<u>F</u>
(1) Anomie	-.040		* p ≤ .05
Internal-External (scale 2)	-.026	None	** p ≤ .01
Internal-External (scale 3)	-.152		*** p ≤ .001
(2) Anomie	.238		
Internal-External (scale 2)	.138	None	
Internal-External (scale 3)	-.007		

^a Adjusted for covariates

The third experimental manipulation--the provision of service information--took place at a specific point in time, namely at the time of the (IOS). Recipients experienced the other two manipulations gradually over time as they had need for services from the agency. This was particularly true in the worker-initiated condition where the worker first contacted the recipient two months after the IOS. Those recipients who, for various reasons, left the project relatively early really experienced little of the service provision experimental manipulation. For this reason, one might expect stronger effects if those who left the program early were excluded from the analysis. The results after this modification of the sample are presented in Table 3 where the figures now represent request rates (with square root transformations) for recipients who were in the project at least two months. When subjects who left the project within two months of the IOS are excluded, mean differences increase or stay the same in all but one case (worker-initiated versus client-initiated for nonfinancial services). The reduced sample size resulting from the exclusion accounts for the lack of statistical significance for the combined-separated main effects.

The data reported to this point support the hypotheses that welfare recipients favor preseparation mode of service delivery. However, it could be argued that the findings presented in Tables 1 and 2 are not a true expression of client preference but instead are artifactual because of the nature of the experimental manipulations. This could result because recipients in the combined service and grant supervision condition and in the worker-initiated conditions necessarily have some contact with a social service worker, whereas recipients in the other conditions need not. This greater exposure could result in more service requests because the worker's presence

Table 3

Effects of Experimental Manipulations on Client Requests for Public Welfare Services (Across All Contacts Excluding Subjects Who Left Project Within Two Months of IOS)

Dependent Variable	A		B	
	Combined (N=51)	Separated (N=48)	Client-Initiated (N=53)	Worker-Initiated (N=46)
(1) New Requests for Financial Services	.25 (.24) ^a	.15 (.16)	.17 (.18)	.23 (.23)
(2) New Requests for Non-financial Services	.37 (.36)	.25 (.26)	.23** (.23)	.40** (.40)

<u>Covariates</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>Significant Interactions</u>	<u>F</u>
(1) Anomie	-.020		
Internal-External (scale 2)	.044	None	* p < .05
Internal-External (scale 3)	-.148		** p < .01
(2) Anomie	.284*		
Internal-External (scale 2)	.075	None	
Internal-External (scale 3)	.060		

^aAdjusted for covariates

makes it easier for recipients to make requests. This is, of course, not totally irrelevant to the issue of separation and is one reason for expecting more service requests in the worker-initiated and combined service condition. On the other hand, it is confounded with the possibility that workers in these conditions may elicit through coercion more requests for services. In addition, as we have noted in the theoretical justification of this study, convenience is not the only reason for expecting greater service utilization in the combined and worker-initiated conditions. Attribution theory argues that the style of workers in these conditions implies concern with recipients' problems and a norm for seeking and providing help with these problems. This alone, according to the theory, should result in increased service requests. In order to examine this hypothesis, an analysis was undertaken utilizing only requests which occurred during client-initiated contacts with workers.

One disadvantage to this approach is that this restriction makes a significant positive effect due to the worker-initiated service manipulation very unlikely. In the client-initiated service condition service requests are concentrated in client-initiated contacts. In the worker-initiated service condition they are spread over worker-initiated and client-initiated contacts. Thus our restricted analysis disproportionately reduces the number of new service requests available for analysis in the worker-initiated condition. On the other hand, under these circumstances a clear test of the combined versus separated service effects is possible. The relevant data are found in Table 4. The comparisons are consistent with those of Table 2, although, as anticipated, only the combined-separated effect remains significant. Again the implication is that separation leads to lessened demand for services.

Table 4

Effects of Experimental Manipulations on Client Requests for
Public Welfare Services (Within Client-Initiated Contacts)

Dependent Variable	A		B	
	Combined (N=53)	Separated (N=54)	Client-Initiated (N=55)	Worker-Initiated (N=52)
(1) New Requests for Financial Services	.21* (.21) ^a	.13* (.13)	.16 (.16)	.18 (.18)
(2) New Requests for Non-financial Services	.29 (.28)	.23 (.24)	.21 (.21)	.31 (.31)

<u>Covariates</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>Significant Interactions</u>	<u>F</u>
(1) Anomie	-.030	None	* $p < .05$
Internal-External (scale 2)	.048		** $p < .01$
Internal-External (scale 3)	-.150		
(2) Anomie	.288*	None	
Internal-External (scale 2)	.184*		
Internal-External (scale 3)	.013		

^aAdjusted for covariates

With respect to the covariates used in analyzing the effects of the experimental manipulations on client utilization of public welfare services, it should be noted that the Anomie Scale is a significant predictor of utilization of nonfinancial services when requests are restricted to those within client-initiated contacts or to those clients who remained in the project for at least two months. In the former case, one of the Internal-External scales is also significant. The signs of these coefficients indicate that subjects who were more alienated and internally oriented tended to request more nonfinancial services.

Alternative Community Agency Service Utilization

The second set of service utilization measures of concern were those indicating use of other social services in the community. Given that it was necessary to rely on recipient reports, at the termination interview, of utilization over the past year, probably the most reliable indicator was a scale constructed from a list of 28 agencies in Hennepin County. Each client was asked to indicate which agencies in the list she had actually used in the past year. The impact of the experimental manipulations on this variable can be seen in Table 5, where the dependent variable has been expressed as the percentage of the 28 agencies from which the client has used services in the past year. Here a significant main effect of the combined-separated condition is observed, with sample members in the separated condition using services from more community agencies than subjects in the combined conditions. This is opposite to the effect of the combined-separated manipulation on utilization of public welfare services. In addition, the level of client knowledge of community social services at intake is significantly related to utilization of

Table 5

**Effects of Experimental Manipulations on Client
Utilization of Community Social Services**

Dependent Variable	A		B	
	Combined (N=32)	Separated (N=34)	Client- Initiated (N=39)	Worker- Initiated (N=27)
Percentage of Services Recipient Has Used within the Past Year	6%** (6%) ^a	10%** (10%)	8% (8%)	8% (8%)

<u>Covariates</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>Significant Interactions</u>	<u>F</u>
Anomie	-.005		* p < .05
Internal-External (scale 2)	.032	None	** p < .01
Internal-External (scale 3)	-.006		
Knowledge of Services	.010*		

^aAdjusted for covariates

these services during the project. As one might expect, those with greater knowledge used the services more.

Two other indicators of recipient utilization of services available in the community were examined. The first of these simply asked sample members if they had gone to any social service agency other than county welfare within the past year. Three response categories were offered--"yes" (coded 1); "no, no problem within the year" (coded 0); an "no, although I had a problem" (coded -1). This measure, then, is a less refined indicator of utilization but also takes into consideration the perceived need for services. The third indicator asked recipients who had gone to an outside agency for help how many times they had gone to the agency about the last problem. Whereas the previous measures represented an attempt to measure the range of service agencies contacted by the recipient, this measure was expected to be more sensitive to the degree to which the recipient used any one agency. Neither of these indicators were significantly affected by the experimental manipulations.

Summary

The above analysis indicates that the two aspects of the separation of services and income maintenance both reduce recipients' requests for services but in different ways. The separation of functions reduces requests for financial services, whereas making worker-client contacts the sole responsibility of clients reduces requests for nonfinancial services. On the other hand, utilization of social service agencies other than the county welfare department seems to increase with the separation of functions.

Client Satisfaction

We now turn to a more subjective evaluation of the impact of the experimental manipulations on clients. This section examines recipients' responses to a number of questions concerning their experiences while in the project. The method used--analysis of covariance--is similar to that described in the previous section; however, the covariate used with each post-test question was simply the matching pre-test attitudinal question.

One question asked recipients to rate their overall experiences with the welfare department. The experimental manipulations were found to have no significant impact on this rating. Mean scores indicated that, overall, recipients found their experience to be satisfactory.³⁰ Two other questions concerned recipients' experiences with the welfare department. One asked the degree to which they felt the welfare department was concerned with helping them. The second asked how fair they thought the welfare department was in dealing with their requests. In neither case were the experimental manipulations found to have any significant impact on responses. Overall, recipients indicated that the department was moderately concerned with helping them³¹ and usually fair in dealing with their requests.³²

The second set of questions involved recipients' views of their social service workers. Table 6 presents an analysis of recipients' opinions regarding how concerned they felt social workers were with helping them. Recipients in the combined condition perceived their workers to be significantly more concerned with helping them than did recipients in the separated condition. Since welfare department workers were randomly assigned cases across all experimental conditions, recipients were not responding to

Table 6

Mean Response Scores to the question "How concerned are social workers with helping you?"

Service Condition			
A		B	
Combined (N=43)	Separated (N=49)	Client- Initiated (N=49)	Worker- Initiated (N=43)
3.54* (3.52) ^b	3.13* (3.14)	3.31 (3.30)	3.33 (3.34)

<u>Covariates</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>Significant Interactions</u>	<u>F</u>
Pretest	.209	None	* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

^a Response categories ranged from "1 - Not at all concerned" to "4 - Very concerned."

^b Adjusted for covariate.

differences resulting from different workers in the two different conditions. Instead, workers must have either acted differently and/or have been perceived differently by clients, depending upon the context in which the interaction took place.

In Table 7 a similar main effect can be seen with respect to recipients' views of the helpfulness of social workers. However, there also exists a significant two-way interaction between the combined-separated and client-initiated--worker-initiated manipulations. An analysis of the interaction shows that recipients found their workers the least helpful under the current mode of separated, client-initiated service delivery. Service workers were seen as most helpful in the combined, client-initiated cell and separated, worker-initiated cell, with the old delivery mode of combined, worker-initiated falling between these two extremes.

The same pattern can be seen in Table 8--respondents' ratings of the helpfulness of their social workers' advice. Recipients found their social workers' advice to be the least helpful under the separated, client-initiated cell and the most helpful in the combined, client-initiated and separated, worker-initiated cells.

The final question asked of recipients concerning their satisfaction with their social workers involved the frequency of contacts with social workers. The mean response scores in Table 9 indicate a highly significant difference between the combined and separated conditions on this variable. Recipients in the combined condition tended to feel that they saw their workers often enough; however, those in the separated condition tended to feel that they did not.

Table 7

Mean Response Scores to the question "How helpful are social workers in solving your problems?"^a

Service Condition			
A		B	
Combined (N=43)	Separated (N=50)	Client- Initiated (N=50)	Worker- Initiated (N=43)
3.49* (3.48) ^b	2.80* (2.81)	2.92 (2.96)	3.35 (3.30)

<u>Covariates</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>Significant Interactions</u>	<u>F</u>	
Pretest	.281	A X B	5.054*	* p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001

Analysis of Interaction

	Client- Initiated	Worker- Initiated
Combined	3.68 (N=22)	3.18 (N=22)
Separated	2.32 (N=28)	3.41 (N=22)

^aResponse categories ranged from "1 - Was not given help" through "2 - Not at all helpful" to "5 - Very helpful"

^bAdjusted for covariate.

Table 8

Mean Response Scores to the Question "How helpful is the social worker's advice in solving your problems?"^a

Service Condition			
A		B	
Combined (N=44)	Separated (N=50)	Client- Initiated (N=51)	Worker- Initiated (N=43)
3.25 (3.21) ^b	2.94 (2.98)	2.85 (2.86)	3.38 (3.37)

Covariates	Beta	Significant Interactions	F	
Pretest	.345	A X B	4.041*	* p < .05 ** p < .01 *** p < .001

Analysis of Interaction

	Client- Initiated	Worker- Initiated
Combined	3.30 (N=23)	3.09 (N=22)
Separated	2.46 (N=28)	3.54 (N=22)

^aResponse categories ranged from "1 - Has never given me advice" through "5 - Very Helpful."

^bAdjusted for covariate

Table 9

Mean Response Scores on Frequency
of Service Worker Contacts^a

Service Condition			
A		B	
Combined (N=44)	Separated (N=49)	Client- Initiated (N=50)	Worker- Initiated (N=43)
1.93*** (1.94) ^b	2.33*** (2.32)	2.22 (2.21)	2.05 (2.05)

<u>Covariates</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>Significant Interactions</u>	<u>F</u>
Pre-test	.088	None	* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

^a Scored "1 - Too often", "2 - Often enough", "3 - Not often enough."

^b Adjusted for covariate.

The final set of questions in this section attempted to determine recipients' views of their rights in relation to their social worker and the welfare department. The first of these questions asked subjects when they felt their service worker had a right to give them advice. Response categories were "1--anytime social worker feels that advice should be given," "2--only when department policy states that advice be given" and "3--only when recipient specifically asks for advice." Analysis of the mean response scores to this question showed no significant effects of the experimental manipulations. The grand mean of 2.22 indicates that recipients tended to believe that workers had a right to give advice only when department policy states that advice be given.

Recipients' responses showed greater variance when asked about the need to follow their service worker's advice on nonfinancial matters: Recipients in the worker-initiated condition felt less of a need in this area than did those in the client-initiated condition. Results of this analysis are shown in Table 10.

Finally, recipients were asked about their right to complain to the welfare department. Response categories ranged from "1 - never" to "4 - always." Although no statistically significant differences were observed between experimental conditions, there was a strong tendency for subjects who were in the separated condition to believe they have a greater right to complain ($F = 3.36, p = .07$).

The above analysis of recipient opinions of their welfare experience suggests that recipients distinguish between the social worker and the welfare department. No significant differences were found between the

Table 10

Recipients Mean Response Score to the Question "Do you have to follow your social worker's advice for your personal and family problems not related to money?" (Y_2E)^a

Service Condition			
A		B	
Combined (N=45)	Separated (N=50)	Client- Initiated (N=52)	Worker- Initiated (N=43)
3.22 (3.21) ^b	3.20 (3.21)	3.06** (2.02)	3.39** (3.47)

<u>Covariates</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>Significant Interactions</u>	<u>F</u>
Pre-test	.198*	None	
			* p < .05
			** p < .01
			*** p < .001

^aResponse categories ranged from "1 - All the time" to "4 - Not at all."

^bAdjusted for covariate.

experimental groups in their answers to questions concerning the welfare department. Experiences with social workers, however, were affected by the experimental manipulations. In general, subjects viewed the new separated delivery system (separated, client-initiated) negatively. Social workers were seen as more concerned and more helpful in the combined condition than in the separated condition. Mean response scores also indicate that recipients in the separated condition tended to feel that they did not see their workers often enough, while those in the combined condition generally felt that they did. Interaction terms indicate that the current delivery mode of separated services, available at the clients' initiative only, is the least favorably viewed of the possible arrangements for service delivery.

While coercion of clients was cited as a rationale for separation, the findings reported here do not support this view. Instead, subjects in the worker-initiated condition were more assertive about their right to reject their social workers' advice.

Ratings by Workers

A third important dimension by which to evaluate the experimental manipulations is their impact on the views of welfare workers. This section presents findings from two sources of worker data--the contact sheets completed by the worker for each contact with a project recipient and the worker termination report completed at the end of the project period for each subject.

For each contact with a client the worker was asked to rate both the client's satisfaction with the interaction and the quality of the interaction. Score response categories ranged from "1 - very satisfied" to "9 - very unsatisfied" for the former and from "1 -

very friendly" to "9 - formal" for the latter, with 5 being the neutral response category for each. These scores were then averaged over all worker-client contacts during the project.

Analysis of covariance results for these two dependent variables are presented in Table 11. For both variables the source of contact initiation had a significant effect on workers' ratings of their interactions with clients. Workers rated the quality of the interactions more highly and felt that the client was more satisfied with these interactions in the worker-initiated condition than in the client-initiated condition. Moreover, the same worker was more likely to view her/his interaction with a client positively and to view the client as more satisfied with the interaction when the worker was free to initiate contacts with the client.

The second source of data on worker views of the client was the termination report. Three variables of interest were identified from these reports. The first was a composite score obtained by summing individual responses on four highly correlated items which asked the worker's view of the client's attitude toward the agency and toward the worker, and how cooperative and likable the client was. Scores could range from a high of 25, indicating a very positive view of the client, to a low of 4, indicating a very negative view. The other two variables asked for the worker's opinion of changes in the client's situation over the course of service contact and for the client's need for service at the last contact with the worker.

The analysis of workers' personal ratings of recipients presented in Table 12 is consistent with the findings of Table 11. Workers saw clients in

Table 11

**Effects of Experimental Manipulations on Worker Ratings
of Interaction with Clients**

Dependent Variable	Service Condition			
	A		B	
	Combined (N=34)	Separated (N=39)	Client- Initiated (N=40)	Worker- Initiated (N=33)
(1) Quality of Interaction ^a	2.32 (2.33) ^c	2.49 (2.48)	2.72** (2.72)	2.03** (2.03)
(2) Client Satisfaction ^b	2.94 (2.94)	2.98 (2.98)	3.20* (3.21)	2.67* (2.65)

<u>Covariates</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>Significant Interactions</u>	<u>F</u>
(1) Self-Inventory	.041	None	
Welfare Attitude (factor score)	.242		* p < .05 ** p < .01
(2) Self-Inventory	.464	None	
Welfare Attitude (factor score)	-.786		

^aResponse categories ranged from "1 - Friendly" to "9 - Formal."

^bResponse categories ranged from "1 - Very satisfied" to "9 - Very unsatisfied."

^cAdjusted for covariate.

Table 12

Effects of Experimental Manipulations on Workers' Perceptions of Clients

	Service Condition			
	A		B	
	Combined (N=34)	Separated (N=39)	Client- Initiated (N=40)	Worker- Initiated (N=33)
(1) Personal Rating ^a	19.21 (19.24) ^b	17.77 (17.74)	17.55* (17.63)	19.52* (19.43)

Covariates	Beta	Significant Interactions	F
(1) W_7	.464	None	* $p \leq .05$
$W_1 F_2$	-.786		** $p \leq .01$
			*** $p \leq .001$

^aScores could range from 24 to 4, with higher scores indicating a more positive view.

^bAdjusted for covariates.

the worker-initiated condition more positively than in the client-initiated condition. The combined-separated effect here approaches statistical significance ($F = 3.124$, $p = .08$), with workers rating clients in the combined condition higher than those in the separated condition.

No significant differences were found between experimental groups with respect to the worker's opinion of changes in the client's situation or her need for service at the last contact.

Client Attitudes and Knowledge

The analysis presented in this section is intended to determine the extent to which clients' experiences with the welfare department changed their general attitudes, perceptions and knowledge of public welfare social service workers and social services.

Thirteen questions were asked of recipients about their attitudes and beliefs concerning public welfare. Nine of these questions coincide directly with the client satisfaction questions discussed earlier. That is, the questions concern the same subject but attitudinal items are worded in general terms and satisfaction items are worded in terms of the client's direct experience.³⁴ The analysis of covariance model used to test the impact of the experimental manipulations here used the matching pre-test score as a covariate, as was done in the analysis of the satisfaction measures. The results, however, differed substantially from those of the latter analysis. None of the response scores to the four questions concerning attitudes toward social service workers generally were significantly affected by the experimental manipulations. Respondents thought service workers were moderately concerned with helping recipients,³⁵ were moderately helpful,³⁶ and saw their clients slightly less often than they should.³⁷

Of the three attitudinal questions concerning the welfare department, two showed no significant differences in the responses of the various experimental groups. Respondents believed the welfare department was generally fair in dealing with recipients' requests³⁸ but that, in general, recipients had less than satisfactory experiences with the department.³⁹ Two additional questions concerning the fairness of welfare department rules and the ability of the welfare department to help people with nonfinancial problems were asked. Neither of these questions resulted in significantly different responses across the experimental manipulations. Mean response scores indicated that recipients thought welfare rules were mostly fair and reasonable,⁴⁰ but they were not sure of the department's ability to help with nonfinancial problems.⁴¹

Responses to the general question of how concerned the welfare department was in helping those who come to them, however, did differ significantly between experimental groups. Results of the analysis for this dependent measure are shown in Table 13. Subjects in the combined condition believed that the welfare department was generally more concerned with helping recipients than did those in the separated condition.

The responses to the two questions concerning the worker's right to give advice and the need for clients to follow this advice were not significantly affected by the experimental manipulations. Recipients indicated that workers should generally give advice only when department policy states that it be given,⁴² and that recipients are seldom required to follow this advice.⁴³

Table 13

Mean Response Scores to the Question, "In general, to what extent do you think the welfare department is really concerned with helping those who come to them?"^a

Service Condition			
A		B	
Combined (N=44)	Separated (N=50)	Client- Initiated (N=51)	Worker- Initiated (N=43)
3.20* (3.18) ^b	2.86* (2.88)	3.10 (3.10)	2.93 (2.92)

<u>Covariates</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>Significant Interactions</u>	<u>F</u>
Pre-test	.446***	None	
			* p < .05
			** p < .01
			*** p < .001

^aResponse categories ranged from "1 - Not at all concerned" to "4 - Very concerned."

^bAdjusted for covariate.

Two final questions on the welfare attitude instrument asked recipients to estimate how many welfare recipients have problems other than financial ones, and what they felt to be the general community feeling toward AFDC recipients. Once again the experimental groups were not found to vary in any significant way. Subjects generally felt that most recipients did have nonfinancial problems⁴⁴ and that the community felt indifferent toward AFDC recipients.⁴⁵

In addition to the above questions concerning attitudes toward the welfare system, project participants were also asked at both pre-test and post-test a series of questions concerning their views on the importance of social services and their knowledge of services available in the community. An analysis of covariance of the post-test ratings of the importance of social services, using the pre-test score as covariate, revealed no significant variation between the experimental conditions. Respondents generally indicated that the types of services provided at the types of agencies listed (day care, family counseling, and mental health) were important.⁴⁶

Post-test scores on the two knowledge of services scales were similarly unaffected by the experimental manipulations. Roughly half of the respondents indicated that they knew what types of services were offered at day care centers, family counseling centers, and mental health clinics.⁴⁷ Respondents indicated that they had heard of 65 percent of the 28 agencies listed on the questionnaire.

To summarize, only 1 of the 16 items reviewed here measuring recipients' post-test attitudes toward welfare, social services and knowledge of social services was significantly affected by the experimental

manipulations. Subjects in the combined condition perceived the welfare department to be more concerned with recipients' problems than did subjects in the separated condition. This finding is consistent with the generally favorable results reported elsewhere in this report concerning the combined-separated manipulation; however, it does not coincide with the results of the client satisfaction measures, which indicated no effect on measures involving the welfare department and considerable variation on questions concerned with social workers in the welfare department. This again suggests that recipients did not generalize from their specific experiences around the experimental manipulations in forming general attitudes toward the agency and its workers.

The lack of significant main effects here is of particular importance in understanding the failure of the provision of service information manipulation to have any significant impact on recipient utilization of services. Since this manipulation was expected to influence utilization by changing attitudes and knowledge about social services, it could only be effective if it first successfully influenced these attitudes and knowledge of services. The findings of this section indicate that this was not achieved.

Psychological impact. The final outcome measures to be examined are the set of seven psychological test scores. An analysis of covariance using the pre-test score as covariate was performed on each of the seven scale scores to determine the impact of the experimental manipulations. In no case was there found to be any significant variation between the experimental groups on any of the post-test psychological scale scores. These test scores were not standardized in any way which would permit meaningful interpretation of mean scores alone.

Possible placebo effects. The final group comparison made was between the controls and the experimental group approximating service delivery in the control group, namely sample members in the separated, client-initiated service group.⁴⁸ Since welfare workers were paid at an overtime rate for handling requests from experimental subjects, one might expect that these subjects were treated in a somewhat different fashion than normal recipients in the agency. In addition to this monetary incentive, the worker's knowledge that a particular case was part of a research project subject to closer scrutiny may have influenced her/his interaction with the recipient. The intent here is to determine to what extent, if any, these factors may have influenced experimentals' scores on outcome measures.

A comparison of mean scores for the major outcome variables between the remaining 25 percent of the control subjects not used in the preliminary analysis and the experimental subjects in the separated, client-initiated condition revealed that seven of the eighteen comparisons are significant at or below the .05 level, while two are significant at or below the .001 level. Although the two groups differed significantly in their utilization of both nonfinancial and financial services, the two differences are in the opposite direction. Experimentals requested more nonfinancial services but controls requested more financial services. The two groups also have significantly different scores on four of the post-test satisfaction measures. Experimentals felt that social workers have less of a right to give advice and that the social worker and the social worker's advice were generally less helpful than control group subjects indicated. Overall, however, experimental subjects rated their experience with the welfare department significantly higher than did controls.

Finally, project workers and agency workers serving control cases were asked about the degree of satisfaction they believed their clients experienced in service worker interactions. Project workers rated their clients at a satisfaction level that was significantly greater than that given by non-project workers to controls. Workers' mean ratings of the quality of their interactions are consistent with this and approach statistical significance ($p = .06$).

While four of the seven observed mean score differences are in the direction one would expect, hypothesizing a Hawthorne or placebo effect, three are in the opposite direction. One would expect that experimentals would be encouraged to make more requests for nonfinancial services, be more satisfied with their welfare experience, and be viewed more favorably by workers. However, given that this is in fact what we observed, it is difficult to see why experimentals should see their social workers less positively and request fewer financial services. We can only comment that the comparison of the control group with its counterpart in the experimental conditions yields conflicting results.

VALIDITY OF PROJECT FINDINGS

In any experimental study, one must be concerned with possible threats to both the internal and external validity of the findings.

Internal Validity

Internal validity refers to the ability to correctly attribute observed differences to the intervention of interest. Random assignment to experimental and control groups allows for such comparisons and interpretations. The major threat to the internal validity of the field experiment, however, was the existence

of considerable missing data for some variables. In some instances the consequences of missing data could be examined by dropping the covariates from the analysis. Because the data set is relatively complete for the dependent variables and major independent variables we were able to examine whether our use of covariance analysis led to results different from what would have been obtained through analysis of variance. If this were the case, it would be unclear whether the cause was the statistical controls provided by covariance analysis or the bias occurring due to missing cases. In fact, analysis of covariance and analysis of variance yielded very similar findings with respect to the effects of the experimental manipulations. In effect, no evidence of any type of selection bias in missing data was found.

A second problem of internal validity arises from assigning to the same worker cases from all treatment conditions. It is possible, in this situation, that workers were influenced by the comparison of one condition to another rather than by either condition alone. If one were to implement the preferred condition (in this case, the worker-initiated condition) in another agency, where workers would not experience both conditions simultaneously, the workers' perceptions of clients in that condition might not be as favorable as in the experiment. While this argument may seem rather tenuous, particularly since workers voiced a preference for the separated, client-initiated condition at the start of the experiment, it cannot be ignored. Other factors, however, should be considered. First, consider an alternative design which would have assigned to each worker cases in one experimental cell only. While this would avoid the problem of workers comparing the various conditions, the effects of workers on recipients would be totally confounded with the experimental manipulations. It would be impossible to determine whether observed differences among experimental groups

were the result of the experimental manipulation, i.e., the structure under which the service was provided, or of the specific workers providing the service.

It should be noted that while assigning workers cases from all conditions creates some ambiguity concerning the interpretation of the outcome variables measuring worker ratings of clients, its threat to the validity of the findings regarding other outcome measures is dependent upon the interrelationships of these various outcome measures. This issue will be examined in greater detail in the discussion of interpretation of the findings.

External Validity

External validity refers to the ability to generalize the findings of a particular study to some broader population. One would like to be able to state with confidence that the findings of the Hennepin County field experiment could be replicated elsewhere, with different staff serving different welfare recipients. Such statements, however, cannot be made. The findings presented here represent only one study done in one community. Moreover, the Hennepin County Public Welfare Department is hardly typical of most big city welfare departments. The most obvious problems of representativeness are the racial and educational disparities between the welfare recipients in Hennepin County and recipients nationwide. Also, the staff of the Hennepin County Welfare Department appeared somewhat better trained and more stable than what is assumed to be typical among public welfare service workers. This represents a threat to the external validity of the study in that most welfare departments may not be able to supply the quality of service supplied by workers participating in this project. In recognizing the validity of this point, it may simply imply that welfare agencies need to provide higher quality services if they are to reach the people in need of these

services. Client characteristics are difficult to manipulate but service delivery systems can and should be changed to accommodate clients.

A final difficulty in generalizing from the results of this study also relates to client characteristics. It will be recalled that certain criteria were used in selecting participants for the study. Specifically, they had to be female heads of families, applying for assistance in Hennepin County for the first time, with no "special problems" (e.g., child abuse and child neglect cases, WIN cases). In effect, then, the project sample is a subset of AFDC recipients. It is not known how the experiences of excluded types of recipients, such as unemployed fathers, might differ from those studied. It should also be pointed out that the study excluded users of public welfare social services who were not eligible for financial assistance. Separation was intended to increase utilization of social services and satisfaction for these individuals as well by dissociating public social services from the provision of financial assistance. No attempt has been made here to evaluate the impact of separation on nonrecipients of welfare.

These shortcomings should not be construed as faults or failures of the Hennepin County project. Probably no single study could answer all questions concerning the impact on clients of a complicated policy change like separation of services. Rather, they point the way for additional data collection in diverse settings which would permit informed policy formulation in this area.

INTERPRETATION

Client Satisfaction

The findings regarding the recipients' views of their social workers are consistent with attribution theory, which predicts that the helper will be viewed

more negatively in situations where the request for help most clearly implies lack of competence on the help-seeker's part. In the areas of concern to public welfare social services, such as budgeting, child rearing, and economic dependence, it is likely that requests for help are particularly difficult to make. By initiating contact the welfare worker not only expresses concern for the client but generates an atmosphere of acceptance; eventually the client may come to initiate contact herself. Similarly, having one worker responsible for both grant supervision and the provision of counseling implies that it is normal for recipients to experience nonfinancial problems; this too promotes a norm for requesting help when problems in either area arise. According to the attribution model these moves by the worker reduce the implication that the help request is an indicator of client incompetence.

These findings are also consistent with theoretical formulations in social psychology regarding the attitudinal effects of exposure. Zajonc provides evidence supporting the hypothesis that "mere repeated exposure of the individual to a stimulus object enhances his attitude toward it."⁴⁹ By mere exposure, Zajonc means "a condition which just makes the given stimulus accessible to the individual's perception."⁵⁰ Such exposure would occur in both the worker-initiated and combined conditions. In the former case, workers contacted the recipients once every two months while in the latter workers were required to make periodic contact concerning grant eligibility. It should be noted, however, that the work Zajonc cites in support of this hypothesis is not in the area of help-seeking behavior. (The attribution hypothesis, on the other hand, has been confirmed in a number of help-seeking experiments in laboratory settings.⁵¹)

The failure of the experiment to have any significant impact on the satisfaction measures related to the welfare agency suggests that recipients do not generalize from their specific experiences with welfare workers in forming opinions about the agency. This interpretation is supported by the findings from the preliminary analysis with the control subjects, which consistently showed that recipients' attitudes toward social workers and agencies represented two distinct dimensions.

Utilization of Services

It will be recalled that subjects in the combined condition made more requests for financial services but less use of community services than did subjects in the separated condition. No statistically significant differences were observed between these two conditions involving requests for nonfinancial services. Since community services were also nonfinancial and, in some ways, similar to the nonfinancial services offered by the public welfare social worker, these findings indicate that subjects in the separated condition did not use community services instead of public services but rather used them in addition to the services offered by the public welfare social worker. The significance of the finding may be questioned because of the weakness of the variable measuring utilization of community services.⁵²

With respect to the increase in financial service requests for those recipients in the combined condition, two possible and mutually compatible explanations are suggested: First, the removal of service workers from grant-monitoring duties in the separated condition is likely to have constrained recipients from making financial service requests of these workers because they were seemingly inappropriate. Second, the prohibition on the eligibility

technician from offering service may have resulted in recipients' viewing the technician as open to any service requests including those of a financial nature.⁵³ Clients in the combined condition were in more convenient and open circumstances. Each could call one worker and request one or both of the two basic services and the worker, through his or her grant-monitoring duties was conveying some interest in the client's life circumstances.

The field experiment provided some evidence supporting these interpretations, at least in terms of the greater number of financial service requests in the combined service condition. From the data collected it was possible to categorize contacts by the types of requests occurring within the contacts. Contacts can then be "financial" if only financial requests are made; "nonfinancial" if only nonfinancial requests are made; or "financial and nonfinancial" if both types are made. An analysis of the effects of the combined-separated manipulation on the number of client-initiated contacts with service workers or eligibility technicians in which both financial and nonfinancial service requests were made revealed that subjects in the combined condition did indeed make use of the opportunity to request both types of services from their workers.⁵⁴ However, the subjects in the combined condition were found also to have initiated more contacts involving only financial requests than did subjects in the separated condition.⁵⁵ This suggests that some factor other than convenience alone was at work--perhaps the changed perceptions of workers as we have already hypothesized.

Increased requests for nonfinancial services within the worker-initiated condition are consistent with attribution theory as discussed under client satisfaction. In the previous discussion of internal validity, however, a

rival hypothesis was suggested. It is possible that workers prefer the worker-initiated condition because of the increased freedom and power it gives them. This, in turn, could lead them to offer better services and/or perceive clients more positively. Clients in this experimental condition might then respond by forming more positive opinions of workers and making more requests for services.

This may have occurred in the experiment through two processes. The first of these presents no challenge to attributing the observed differences between the worker- and client-initiated conditions to the experimental manipulations. This hypothesis suggests that the workers' preference for the worker-initiated condition would have emerged even if workers had been randomly assigned to conditions. In this situation the worker's liking for the condition could lead to greater liking for recipients in that condition and/or cause them to offer better services, thereby influencing client satisfaction and requests for services. This explanation differs from a model that predicts direct effects of the experimental manipulations on client satisfaction and utilization and has some social policy relevance; however, the two are consistent in that the observed differences in client satisfaction and requests can still be attributed either directly or indirectly to the experimental manipulation. The more elaborate explanation hypothesizing effects through worker satisfaction is somewhat less likely than the direct effects hypothesis, if only because at the start of the experiment workers expressed a preference for the separated, client-initiated condition.

The second way in which workers might come to prefer the worker-initiated condition poses more serious threats to the interpretation of the findings. This argument is essentially the same as above, but attributes the workers' preference only to their opportunity to compare

the worker-initiated with the client-initiated conditions. In other words, if workers were not assigned to all conditions they would not have preferred the worker-initiated model. They would not like clients in this condition better and would not offer better services. Clients in the worker-initiated condition would not express greater satisfaction and would not request more nonfinancial services. According to this interpretation, the findings of the experiment are artifactual.

While no data are available on workers' preferences of the various experimental conditions or the quality of the services provided, it is possible to test one aspect of this rival hypothesis. If workers' preferences for the worker-initiated condition cause them to like clients in this condition more, and if this in turn leads to greater client satisfaction and requests for services, requests for services must be dependent upon workers' perceptions of clients. In other words, workers' perceptions of clients must be an intervening variable in a causal model relating the experimental manipulations to client requests for services. This can be tested by introducing the workers' ratings of clients as covariates in the analysis of the effects of the experimental manipulations on client requests for nonfinancial services and satisfaction with workers. If the workers' perceptions of clients are intervening variables through which the experimental manipulations influence client requests and satisfaction, this procedure should greatly reduce or eliminate any experimental effects on the utilization and satisfaction measures. The results of this analysis are presented in Tables 14 to 17. Comparison of adjusted and unadjusted mean scores in these tables shows that while some reduction of differences between the worker- and client-initiated conditions results from the introduction of the three worker rating variables (quality of

Table 14

Effects of Experimental Manipulations
on Client Requests for Public Welfare
Services (Across All Contacts)

Dependent Variable	Service Condition			
	A		B	
	Combined (N=49)	Separated (N=57)	Client- Initiated (N=56)	Worker- Initiated (N=50)
(1) New Requests for Financial Services	.30*** (.30) ^a	.14*** (.13)	.20 (.18)	.22 (.24)
(2) New Requests for Non-financial Services	.36 (.36)	.29 (.29)	.22*** (.23)	.43*** (.42)

<u>Covariates</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>Significant Interactions</u>	<u>F</u>
(1) Quality of interaction	.058*		
Client satisfaction	-.035		
Personal rating	-.006	None	
(2) Quality of interaction	-.013		
Client satisfaction	-.031		
Personal rating	.010	None	

^aAdjusted for covariates

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

*** $p \leq .001$

Table 15

Effects of Experimental Manipulations on
Client Requests for Public Welfare Services
(Within Client-Initiated Contacts)

Dependent Variable	Service Condition			
	A		B	
	Combined (N=69)	Separated (N=57)	Client- Initiated (N=56)	Worker- Initiated (N=50)
(1) New Requests for Financial Services	.27** (.28) ^a	.14** (.13)	.20 (.18)	.20 (.22)
(2) New Requests for Non-financial Services	.29 (.28)	.22 (.22)	.21 (.22)	.29 (.29)

<u>Covariates</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>Significant Interactions</u>	<u>F</u>
(1) Quality of interaction	.058		
Client satisfaction	-.031		
Personal rating	-.007	None	
(2) Quality of interaction	-.001		
Client satisfaction	-.002		
Personal rating	.013	None	

^aAdjusted for covariates

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

Table 16

Recipients Mean Response Scores to the Question
 "How helpful are social workers in solving your problems?"^a

Service Condition			
A		B	
Combined (N=42)	Separated (N=49)	Client- Initiated (N=49)	Worker- Initiated (N=42)
3.45 [*] (3.45) ^b	2.82 [*] (2.82)	2.94 (3.06)	3.31 (3.16)

<u>Covariates</u>	<u>Beta</u>	<u>Significant Interactions</u>	<u>F</u>
Pre-test	.150	A X B	4.952 [*]
Quality of interaction	.191 [*]		
Client satisfaction	-.349 ^{***}		
Personal rating	.144		

Analysis of Interaction

	Client - Initiated	Worker - Initiated
Combined	3.68 (N=22)	3.18 (N=22)
Separated	2.32 (N=28)	3.41 (N=22)

^aResponse categories ranged from "1 - Was not given help" through
 "2 - Not at all helpful" to "5 - Very helpful."

^bAdjusted for covariates

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

*** $p \leq .001$

Table 17

Recipients Mean Response Scores to the Question
 "How helpful is the social worker's advice in solving your problems?"^a

Service Condition			
A		B	
Combined (N=42)	Separated (N=49)	Client- Initiated (N=49)	Worker- Initiated (N=42)
3.24 (3.22) ^b	2.96 (2.98)	2.88 (2.94)	3.34 (3.26)

Covariates	Beta	Significant Interactions	F
Pre-test	.264	A X B	4.421*
Quality of interaction	.161		
Client satisfaction	-.299*		
Personal rating	.105		

Analysis of Interaction

	Client - Initiated	Worker - Initiated
Combined	3.30 (N=23)	3.09 (N=22)
Separated	2.46 (N=28)	3.54 (N=22)

^a Response categories ranged from "1 - Has never given me advice" through "2 - Not at all helpful" to "5 - Very helpful."

^b Adjusted for covariates

* $p \leq .05$

** $p \leq .01$

*** $p \leq .001$

interaction, client satisfaction and personal rating) these variables do not nearly account for the total experimental-control differences. Looking at all contacts (Table 14) recipients in the worker-initiated condition still request more nonfinancial services from their workers than do recipients in the client-initiated condition (significant at the .001 level). The same comparison within the client-initiated contacts (Table 15) is no longer statistically significant; however, it will be noted that the unadjusted mean score differences in Table 15 are not quite as large as they are in the comparable Table 4 (.08 for the former compared to .10 for the latter). This is due to the fact that the samples for the two tables are slightly different as a result of missing data on the different covariates. The reduction in mean score differences attributable to the covariates in Table 15 is rather small (.08 unadjusted to .07 adjusted for the covariates).

Similar results emerge for the two client satisfaction measures which indicate that recipients in the separated, client-initiated condition found their workers to be the least helpful. This interaction continues to be significant when controlling for workers' perceptions of clients.⁵⁶

These findings suggest that the workers' perceptions of clients is not an intervening variable in the causal relationship between the experimental manipulations and clients' requests for services of satisfaction with their workers. The observed differences in requests for nonfinancial services between worker- and client-initiated conditions can therefore be attributed to the experimental manipulation with greater confidence.

PROGRAM IMPLICATIONS

The findings from the Hennepin County field experiment suggest that problems with separation may exist. At the very least, they indicate that separation may deter recipients from requesting services that they apparently utilize under the preseparation model. However, it is necessary to distinguish between requests for services, actual services received, and actual need for services. The outcome measure used here was requests for services. It is not known whether recipients actually received more needed services.

Subjects in the combined condition were found to make more requests for financial services than subjects in the separated condition. If, as appears to be the case, more assertive and less alienated recipients⁵⁷ make more requests, this result could lead to greater inequities within the program since the provision of these additional financial services would not necessarily be based on need alone. On the other hand, eligibility rules do exist which define what financial assistance a recipient can receive. Requesting more financial aid may not necessarily result in more assistance being received but the recipient should receive more of the benefits for which she qualifies. Elaborate rules exist for determining eligibility and benefit levels for financial assistance. These rules define need. Recipients should be encouraged to obtain maximum allowable benefits if the program goal of alleviating poverty is to be realized.

Recipients in the worker-initiated condition were found to request more nonfinancial services than did those in the client-initiated condition. Once again, it is not known what actual services were received, and defining need for this type of service is quite difficult. Within a consumer-oriented

approach to the evaluation of welfare programs, however, a good argument can be made for defining need, with fiscal restraints, as what clients indicate that they want. This approach maintains that social work services should speak to the views and desires of clients as well as those of funders, as client satisfaction and demand for service are considered legitimate, even high priority, evaluation criteria.⁵⁸ In part, the stated rationale for supporting separation involved the issue of recipients' rights to "self-determination."⁵⁹ What position do we take now if recipients indicate a preference for the pre-separation delivery model? Do we presume to know what is best for them and ignore their preferences? This appears to be the strategy used by writers in the early 1970s who presumed to know what was best for recipients without any evidence to support such a position.

Separation of social services from income maintenance services may be necessary and even desirable from the perspective of organizational efficiency and accountability and to permit a move toward universal public social services. However, its impact on AFDC recipients cannot be ignored. If such separation occurs, steps must be taken to offset the negative impact on recipients of financial assistance. One possibility is suggested by the experimental design. Separation actually involved two dimensions. Services can be separated or combined with grant-monitoring functions and they can be initiated by clients or by workers. Combining the two factors resulted in four possible structures for delivering social and financial services, only two of which were considered in the policy change of 1973. Services could remain separated from financial assistance but workers could be made responsible for initiating contacts periodically with the clients to offer their services. Recipients would remain free to reject or accept this offer. The nature of the services offered would be

critical under such a model. Keith-Lucas refers to this as the "co-planning" approach. He distinguishes this from the therapeutic approach of the preseparation public social services and the "warehouse" or social utilities approach characteristic of the separated delivery system. The differences can be illustrated by the way each classifies or describes services. The therapeutic orientation approaches services in terms of problems or populations at risk, with the general idea being that the therapists then treat these problems in the way that they think best. The warehouse approach lists services in terms of what is provided. Co-planning, however, identifies what people need help with, and consequently what kind of help the agency gives.⁶⁰

Some might argue that despite the lack of evidence of significant worker coercion of welfare recipients into accepting unwanted services the potential for such abuse must be eliminated by making all contacts with service workers at the clients' initiative. If this position is taken one must consider alternative strategies for facilitating entry into the service system. The provision of full service information in the field experiment represents such an attempt. The findings indicate that it simply is not strong enough to influence utilization patterns. One possible alternative is to upgrade the eligibility technician or case aide position to include more responsibility for making referrals and linkages to other services. Numerous programs have been undertaken across the country to train bartenders, barbers, and beauticians to make referrals because of their close contact with people who may be experiencing problems. It seems ridiculous that such training would not be provided for public welfare workers who daily contact families in serious financial need.

NOTES

Tom MacDonald, Ph.D., is Assistant Professor at the George Warren Brown School of Social Work at Washington University. Irving Piliavin, Ph.D., is Professor of Social Work at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and Research Affiliate at the Institute for Research on Poverty.

¹George Hoshino, "Separation and Chaos" (paper presented at the National Conference on Social Welfare, Atlantic City, May 28, 1973). At the present time no listing is available of state and local public assistance programs that have implemented separation; however, their number is unquestionably large.

²George Hoshino, "Separating Maintenance from Social Service," Public Welfare, 30 (Spring 1972):54-61; and "Money and Morality: Income Security and Personal Social Services," Social Work, 16 (April 1971):16-24; Gordon Hamilton, "Separating Money Services," Social Work, 7 (January 1962): 2, 128; HEW, "Report of the Task Force on Social Services," mimeographed (Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, September 1, 1966); Eveline Burns, "What's Wrong with Public Welfare," Social Service Review, 36 (June 1962):111-22; Winifred Bell, "Too Few Services to Separate," Social Work, 18 (March 1973):66-76.

³Winford Oliphant, "Observations on Administration of Social Services in the States," Child Welfare, 53 (May 1974):279-85; Harris Chaiklin and Carol Landau Frank, "Separation, Service Delivery and Family Functioning," Public Welfare, 31 (Winter 1973):2-7.

⁴Bell, op. cit., pp. 67-69.

⁵Hamilton, op. cit., p. 128.

⁶Hoshino, "Separating Maintenance," p. 58.

⁷Ibid.; Social and Rehabilitation Service, The Separation of Services from Assistance Payments: A Guide for State Agencies (Washington, D.C.: Social and Rehabilitation Service, 1972).

⁸See footnote 2.

⁹Hoshino, "Money and Morality," p. 17.

¹⁰It has been noted that, in theory, recipients could refuse services under the preseparation format but that in reality they feel obligated to accept it because of their dependent and consequently subservient status (see Social and Rehabilitation Service, *op. cit.*)

¹¹Scott Briar, "Welfare from Below: Recipients' Views of the Public Welfare System" in The Law of the Poor, ed. Jacobus ten Broek (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1966), pp. 46-61; Joel Handler and Ellen Jane Hollingsworth, The Deserving Poor (Chicago: Markham Publishing Co., 1971).

¹²According to Handler and Hollingsworth, workers did believe that one of their most important responsibilities was to help recipients become economically independent. But they saw the most important means of achieving this end as job finding and provision of support services, rather than rectifications of personal pathologies (pp. 44-55).

¹³Ibid., pp. 107-33.

¹⁴Hamilton, *op. cit.*

¹⁵Hoshino, "Separating Maintenance."

¹⁶Melvin Mogulof, "Elements of a Special Revenue Sharing Proposal for the Social Services: Goal Setting, Decategorization, Planning and Evaluation," Social Service Review, 47 (December 1973);593-604; Jerome Schwartz and Milton Chernin, "Participation of Recipients in Public

footnote 16 cont.

Welfare Planning and Administration," Social Service Review, 41 (March 1967):10-22; Ralph Kramer, Participation of the Poor: Comparative Community Case Studies in the War on Poverty (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969).

¹⁷ Jack W. Brehm, A Theory of Psychological Reactance (New York: Academic Press, 1966); Jack W. Brehm and A.H. Cole, "Effects of a Favor Which Reduces Freedom," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 3 (April 1966):420-26.

¹⁸ E.E. Jones and K.E. Davis, "From Acts to Dispositions: The Attribution Process in Person Perception," in Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, ed. Leonard Berkowitz (New York: Academic Press, 1965), 2:220-66; Harold H. Kelley, "Attribution Theory in Social Psychology," in The Nebraska Symposium on Behavior, ed. David Levine (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1967), pp. 192-238.

¹⁹ Richard C. Tessler and Shalom H. Schwartz, "Help Seeking, Self Esteem and Achievement Motivation," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 21 (March 1972):318-26.

²⁰ Lorraine Broll, Alan E. Gross, and Irving Piliavin, "Effects of Offered and Requested Help on Help Seeking and Reactions to Being Helped," Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 4 (October 1974):244-58.

²¹ Ann W. Thyne and Anita G. Schroeder, National Study of Social Services to Children and Their Families: Overview (Rockville, Md.: Westat, Inc., March 1978), pp. 25-26.

²²This was decided by the following criteria:

a. In cases where there were two forms filled out by the same S.W. or E.T., (having forgotten that they had already sent one in), and the two were slightly different, the earlier dated sheet was used.

b. In cases of different social workers the S.W. with more contact sheets with the client during the year in the program was used. In addition, duration of contact (number of minutes) was a factor when the number of contacts was approximately equal.

c. In cases where there were both E.T. and S.W. summary sheets, the social worker sheet was usually used. This was done partly because the S.W. usually seemed to know the client's situation better. Even though there might have been more E.T. contacts, these contacts usually were only three to five minutes long--time enough for the client to make a request, but not long enough to get to know the client.

d. In the case where one of the E.T.s or S.W.s left blanks in the Termination Summary Sheets and the other did not, the sheet used was the one without blanks--leaving blanks indicated that the client was not known well enough by the S.W. or E.T.

²³L. Srole, "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries," American Sociological Review, 21 (1966):709-16.

²⁴M. Rosenberg, Society and the Adolescent Self-Image (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1965).

²⁵J.B. Rotter, "Generalized Expectancies for Internal versus External Control of Reinforcement," Psychological Monographs, 80(1) (1966), (Whole No. 609).

²⁶P. Gurin, G. Gurin and M. Beatie, "Internal-External Control in the Motivational Dynamics of Negro Youth," Journal of Social Issues 25(3) (1969):29-53.

²⁷For a discussion of this procedure, see R. Kirk, Experimental Design: Procedures for the Behavioral Sciences (Belmont, California: Brooks-Cole, 1968).

²⁸The analysis of covariance models involves controlling for covariates (in this case pre-test variables) while analyzing the effects of the experimental manipulations on the dependent variables. Readers not familiar with this procedure are advised to consult N.R. Draper and H. Smith Applied Regression Analysis (New York: Wiley, 1966) or any other text dealing with multiple regression analysis.

²⁹The results presented in this section were obtained using programs "Factor," "Anova," and "Breakdown" from Norman Nil et al, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, second ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975).

³⁰Response categories ranged from "1 - very unsatisfactory" through "3 - satisfactory" to "4 - very satisfactory." The mean response score for experimental subjects was 3.13.

³¹Response categories ranged from "1 - not at all concerned" to "4 - very concerned," with experimental subjects averaging 3.00.

³²Response categories ranged from "1 - always unfair" through "3 - usually fair" to "4 - always fair." The mean response score for experimental subjects was 3.11.

³³An analysis of the marginals for these two variables revealed that slightly more than half of the recipients were viewed as having no need for service at the last contact, while the client's situation was viewed as having stayed the same for 58 percent of the respondents.

³⁴For example, a question concerning client satisfaction was worded "How concerned are social workers in helping you?" As an opinion item, the form of the query was changed to "How concerned are social workers in helping recipients?"

³⁵Response categories ranged from "1 - not at all concerned" to "4 - very concerned." The mean response score for experimentals was 3.09.

³⁶Response categories ranged from "1 - not at all helpful" to "4 - very helpful". The mean response score for experimentals was 2.72.

³⁷Response categories were "1 - too often," "2 - often enough" and "3 - not often enough." The mean response score for experimentals was 2.31.

³⁸Response categories ranged from "1 - always unfair" to "4 - always fair." The mean response score for experimentals was 2.90.

³⁹Response categories ranged from "1 - very unsatisfactory" to "4 - very satisfactory." The mean response score for experimentals was 2.76.

⁴⁰Response categories ranged from "1 - few or none are fair and reasonable" to "4 - all or most are fair and reasonable." The mean response score for experimentals was 3.69.

⁴¹Response categories were "1 - yes," "2 - not sure" and "3 - no." The mean response score for experimentals was 1.85.

⁴²Response categories were "1 - anytime social worker feels advice should be given," "2 - only when department policy states it be given" and "3 - only when recipient specifically asks for advice." The mean response score for experimentals was 2.19.

⁴³Response categories ranged from "1 - all the time" to "4 - not all." The mean response score for experimentals was 3.08.

⁴⁴Response categories were "1 - all or almost all," "2 - most," "3 - about half," "4 - less than half," and "5 - few or none." The mean response score for experimentals was 2.25.

⁴⁵Response categories were "1 - very hostile," "2 - fairly hostile," "3 - indifferent," "4 - fairly friendly," and "5 - very friendly." The mean response score for experimentals was 3.09.

⁴⁶The scale score is the sum of the responses to three questions asking the subject if each type of service is important. Response categories for each are "1 - yes," "2 - not sure," and "3 - no." Scale scores, then, can range from 3 to 9, with lower scores indicating greater importance attached to these services. The mean response score for experimentals was 3.85.

⁴⁷The scale score is the sum of the responses to three questions asking if the respondent knows the services offered by each type of agency. Response categories for each item are "1 - knows," "2 - doesn't know." Scale scores may range from 3 to 6. Dividing the mean response by the number of items yields a mean score per item of 1.54, indicating that on the average 46 percent answered "1 - knows" to each question.

⁴⁸Since the provision of service information was known to have no significant effects, the experimental group was not distinguished on this dimension for purposes of comparison with the controls.

⁴⁹Robert B. Zajonc, "Attitudinal Effects of Mere Exposure," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Monograph Supplement, 9:2, Part 2 (June 1968):1.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ See, for example, Lorraine Broll, Alan E. Gross and Irving Piliavin, "Effects of Offered and Requested Help on Help Seeking and Reactions to Being Helped," Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 4 (October 1974): 244-58.

⁵² It was not possible to monitor subjects' contacts with community social service agencies during the course of the study as was done with contacts with the public welfare workers. Instead, subjects were asked, at termination from the project, to indicate from a list of twenty-eight agencies which agencies they had contacted within the past year.

⁵³ Irving Piliavin and Alan Gross, "The Effects of Separation of Services and Income Maintenance on AFDC Recipients," Institute for Research on Poverty Discussion Paper No. 401-77 (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1977):26.

⁵⁴ Using contact rates per client-month with square root transformations, subjects in the combined group were found to have a group mean of .17 compared to .09 for the separated condition ($t = 2.39$, $p \leq .01$).

⁵⁵ Using contact rates per client-month with square root transformations, subjects in the combined group were found to have a group mean of .39 compared to .22 for the separated condition ($t = 3.64$, $p \leq .001$).

⁵⁶ Comparing Tables 17 and 18 with Tables 9 and 10 shows that the results remain basically the same with either set of covariates

⁵⁷ As indicated from the signs of the covariates in Tables 2 through 4.

⁵⁸ For further elaboration of this perspective, see Irving Piliavin, "Restructuring the Provision of Social Services," Social Work, 13 (1963): 34-41; and Robert Morris, "Welfare Reform 1973: The Social Services Dimension," Science, 181 (1973):515-22.

⁵⁹Alan Keith-Lucas, "Philosophies of Public Social Service," Public Welfare, 31 (1) (Winter, 1973):22.

⁶⁰Ibid., pp. 22-24.